409. Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Will the Government be pleased to place on the Table of the House a statement showing:—

(a) the names of gazetted officers in the service of the State who have been given extension or have been appointed after their 55th year;

(b) the period for which they have been so appointed or given extension;

(c) the date on which such appointment or extension is to come to an end;

(d) will the Government be pleased to state the reason why such appointments have been made or the extension given?

Mr. U. Kandar Menon.—A statement giving the information is appended. (*Vide Appendix I.*)

410. Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) is not retirement after completing the 55th year compulsory as a rule, and is not the rule that extension should be granted in the case of officers who are so very competent and healthy as to be retained in service in the interests of the public and whom it is not possible to replace by other officers in service who have not obtained the 55th year;

(2) when an officer's name is included in the list of persons ordered to be retired in the printed Proceedings referred to in the previous question, is not that order the result of a careful consideration of the question of the extension of service to that officer and its decision in the negative;

(3) have there been cases during the last 4 years in which officers ordered to be retired in the printed Proceedings have been given extensions subsequently; if so, their names and for what reasons the orders were re-considered?

Mr. K. Krishna Pisharodi.—(1) The rule is that "an officer in superior service who has attained the age of 55 years shall be required to retire unless the Diwan considers that the public interests require his retention and permits him to remain in the service."

(2) The order in the Proceedings is the result of giving effect to the general rule that an officer who has attained the age of 55 years should retire.

(3) There was no reconsideration. The applicability of the exception to the General Rule was alone considered.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Is not that order passed after careful consideration? In the answer given to part (1), the wording used is 'an officer in superior service who has attained the age of 55 years shall be required to retire.'

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

APPENDIX I.

(Vide answer to Question No. 409.)

Gazetted officers in the service given extension or appointed after their 55th year.

	Names of officers	Period of appointment or extension	Date of termination of the appointment or extension	Reason for the appointment or extension
1	Mr. P. Damodara Menon, Special Officer for Harbour and Railway	One year	12— 9—1104	In the interests of the service.
2	Diwan Bahadur, Dr. V. Verghese, Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer	First appointed on 11th Medam 1099 and extension of of service granted for one year from 11th Medam 1103	11— 9—1104	The appointment was made and extension granted in the interest of the State.
3	Mr. C. Matthai, Director of Public Instruction	2½ years	15— 9—1104	Extension granted in the interest of the service,
4	Mr. M. B. Labouchardire	One year	29—10—1929	His retention was considered necessary when the improvements proposed by the Jail Committee are to be introduced.
5	I. Kittunni Menon, Spt. Head clerk, Police Commissioner's Office	8½ months	1 —10—1104	In the interests of the service.